

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated March 28, 2006, claims 1-21 were rejected. Applicant now requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e)**

In the seventh paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316 (“DeBoor”).

This rejection is now traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for providing a more detailed explanation of the rejection over DeBoor and address the Examiner’s contentions below.

Claim 1 recites:

A method for the direct execution of an XML-document in a data processing system, comprising:

defining the local behavior and process for each element of the XML-document;

integrating executable instructions with at least one XML-document or a document type definition (DTD); and

storing intermediate states of the execution process in a memory of the data processing system by dynamically creating and redefining attributes of elements of the XML document, where the intermediate states define intermediate states of the execution of the executable instructions.

Applicant disagree with the Examiner’s contention that DeBoor discloses at least “storing intermediate states of the execution process ,... where the intermediate states define intermediate states of the execution process.” The Examiner relies on two lines of one claim of DeBoor (col. 62, lines 9-10) which reads “replacing the tag [in a second markup page] to form a combined markup language page.” Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that these

tags are in any way “intermediate states” defining states of the execution of executable instructions. To the best of applicant’s understanding, the tags of DeBoor do not define states of execution of executable instructions.

Claim 14 is patentable for a similar reason to claim 1.

Claim 7 recites:

A system for use with the method according to one of the preceding claims, comprising:

a server providing services to at least one client by executing at least parts of a XML-document according to a XML-robot specification sent from the client to the server or a server providing services to at least one client by sending a XML-robot specification and a XML-document to the client, such that said service is provided by executing at least part of the sent document on the client according to the sent XML-robot specification.

Applicants fail to understand how the section of DeBoor cited by the Examiner discloses anything having to do with an XML-robot specification sent from a client. While DeBoor does indeed disclose that data travels between a client and a server, applicants disagree that this data is in any way the same as the claimed invention. DeBoor discloses that a first form contains data used to fetch a next form. This is in no way the same and 1) an XML robot specification and an XML-document. At best, DeBoor discloses an XML document.

For similar reasons, DeBoor does not anticipate claim 11, since claim 11 also recites means for graphical display of an XML robot specification. As discussed above, DeBoor does not disclose an XML robot.

With regard to claim 12, as discussed before, mention of a “flowchart” in the description of the drawings does not disclose the “graphical flow chart” as recited in applicants’ claim 12. Similarly, the portion of DeBoor cited by the Examiner merely states a

property of standard XML and does not disclose or suggest transition rules as recited in claim 12 (or claim 13).

With regard to claims 15, 16, 17, and 18, DeBoor completely fails to disclose at least the compiler or interpreter of these claims. The mere fact that an XML system performs interpretation on the client side is not the same as applicants' recited invention.

With regard to claims 20 and 21, the Examiner merely cites the same portion of DeBoor that describes a conventional markup language system. Applicant fails to understand how this discloses the claimed invention, including at least setting a global variable to refer to a module element describing the execution behavior of the root, and basically every element of the claims from thereon. The portions of DeBoor cited by the Examiner merely describe a conventional system and provide no mention of setting a current variable to a document's root or any of the other recited method steps.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and requests allowance of them.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,  
PHILIPP W. KUTTER

Date: September 28, 2006\_\_\_\_

By:

  
Laura A. Majerus, Reg. No. 33,417  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Phone: (650) 335-7152  
Fax: (650) 938-5200